

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)
	10/775,986		YANUS ET AL.
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Christopher RoDee		1795

All Participants:

(1) Christopher RoDee.

(2) Rick Klein.

Date of Interview: 13 June 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential 103 rejection over Horgan in US Patent 6,933,089

Claims discussed:

1, 6-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23-27, 30, 31, and 36

Prior art documents discussed:

Horgan in US Patent 6,933,089

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel to suggest an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the Examiner suggested that claim 1 be canceled and all claims currently dependent on claim 1 be made dependent on claim 36. Claim 1 as presented would not be allowable for essentially those reasons given in the Office action of 18 July 2007 for claim 35. Counsel proposed that claim 36 be amended to include thicknesses of "about" 29 microns in keeping with the examples and the general disclosure. The Examiner agreed to this proposal. Further, the Examiner stated that Horgan in US Patent 6,933,089 (US application 10/320808; US Patent Application Pub.: 2004/0115545) would render claim 36 unpatentable when considered with Otsuka in US Patent 5,130,222, but that a statement under section 103c, if possible, would remove Horgan in its patent or application publication because both documents are only available under section 102e of Code. Counsel provided such a statement, which is attached to this Office action.